REMARKS

The Office Action mailed May 19, 2005 considered and rejected claims 1-28.[1]

By this paper, claims 1, 6, 8-11, 16-19, and 24 have been amended[2] and claims 12-14, 20-23 and 25 have been cancelled, such that claims 1-11, 15-19, 24, and 26-28 remain pending, of which claims 1, 24, and 26 are the only independent claims under consideration.

The invention is generally directed to facilitating domain name resolution for computer devices whose native host name data protocol is not compatible with host name data resolution protocols across a particular connection on a network. The invention allows for a replacement host name resolver to be used in conjunction with the native host name resolver to resolve host names by the replacement host name resolver being able to request domain names over a communications link connecting the requesting computer to the network.

For example, claim 1 is directed to a method implemented by a computer system that requests domain name resolution. The method includes assigning the requesting computer as a name server for the requesting computer. The method further includes requesting resolution of a host name by sending host name data in a first protocol to the requesting computer as the name server assigned for the requesting computer. The host name data is compatible for resolution of the host name by a DNS server, however, the first protocol is not compatible for resolving host name data over a communications link connecting the requesting computer to the network. The method further includes monitoring a name resolution of the requesting computer for receiving the host name data in the first protocol from the requesting computer. The host name data in the first protocol is rerouted to a replacement host name resolver in the requesting computer system. The host name data from the replacement host name resolver is sent using a second protocol,

---

[1] Claims 1-12, 17-22, 24, and 26-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Aziz et al., US 6,119,234 (*Aziz*). Claims 13-14, 16, 23 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Aziz* in view of Tan et al., US 6,314,469 (*Tan*). Claim 15 was rejected under U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Aziz* and *Tan*, in further in view of Microsoft Computer Dictionary Fifth Edition, Copyright 2002. Although the prior art status and some of the assertions made with regard to the cited art is not being challenged at this time, because it is not necessary, for reasons described herein, Applicants reserve the right to challenge the prior art status and assertions made with regard to the cited art, as well as any official notice, which was taken in the last response, at any appropriate time in the future, should the need arise, such as, for example in a subsequent amendment or during prosecution of a related application. Accordingly, Applicants' decision not to respond to any particular assertions or rejections in this paper should not be construed as Applicant acquiescing to said assertions or rejections.

[2] Support for the amendments and new claims is found throughout the specification, but primarily at [0036]-[0037]

Page 11 of 14

which is compatible for resolving host name data over a communications link connecting the requesting computer to the network, to a module for resolving the host name data.

Claim 24 is similar to claim 1, but includes functional 'step for' language, as opposed to some of the non-functional 'act of' language used in claim 1.

Claim 26, the last independent claim, is directed to a computer program product with computer executable instructions for performing the method of claim 1.

Applicant respectfully submits that all of the pending claims are allowable and distinguished over the art of record. In particular, the claims of the present application recite elements that are neither anticipated by nor made obvious by the art of record. For example, the art of record fails to disclose, among other things, the recited elements of sending host name data using a first protocol where the host name data is compatible for resolution of the host name by a DNS server and where the first protocol is incompatible for resolving host name data over a communications link connecting the requesting computer to the network and sending the host name data from a replacement host name server in the requesting computer system using a second protocol to a module for resolving the host name data where the second protocol is compatible for resolving host name data over a communications link connecting the requesting computer to the network, particularly in combination with the other recited claim elements.

Examples of some of the embodiments and novelty corresponding to the amended claims is found in paragraphs [0037] and [0038] of the applicant's disclosure, as read in view of paragraph [0006], which states that a compatible DNS request is typically one or more UDP packets. Paragraph [0037], for example, clarifies that in some situations a UDP connection may not be supported between a requesting computer system and a resolving computer system. Thus when a requesting computer issues a DNS request over UDP, the host name data is compatible for resolution of the host name, but the first protocol (UDP) is incompatible for resolving host name data over a communications link connecting the requesting computer to the network. To solve this problem, as explained in paragraph [0038], a UDP request is sent from the requesting computer to a replacement host resolver in the requesting computer which sends a TCP request to the resolving computer, where TCP is a second protocol that is compatible for resolving host name data over a communications link connecting the requesting computer to the network. As noted above, this is just one illustrative example among many that could be used to demonstrate the novelty of the claims.

Aziz is generally directed to allowing authorized clients secure access to hosts on private networks. *See e.g. Abstract.* While *Aziz* discloses several methods of resolving domain names[3], *Aziz* fails to discuss protocols as they relate to resolving domain names. The only discussion of protocols in *Aziz* relates to protocols for cryptography and tunneling. Col. 3, lines 24-26, col. 5, lines 36-39, and col. 7, lines 57-59. As such, *Aziz* clearly fails to disclose or suggest the use of two different protocols by a requesting computer system where one is incompatible for resolving host name data on the network and the second being compatible for resolving host name data on the network, as claimed.

Tan also fails to compensate for the deficiencies of *Aziz*. In particular, *Tan* fails to disclose a first protocol where the host name data is compatible for resolution of the host name while the protocol is incompatible for resolving host name data on the network. In direct contrast, Tan discloses receiving a DNS request *including a domain name in a non-DNS encoding type* and transmitting a DNS request with the domain name in a DNS encoding type that is compatible with the DNS protocol. Col. 4, lines 30-34. Thus the disclosure of *Tan* illustrates modifying the actual host name data because the host name data is in compatible for resolution of the host. Specifically, the domain name data disclosed by Tan is encoded using various non-DNS encoding types so as enable the use of various encoding types for languages not supported by DNS. *Abstract.* This is in direct contrast to what is recited by the claims of the present application, which is that the host name data is compatible for resolution of the host name.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims are not, therefore, anticipated or made obvious by *Aziz* and/or *Tan* alone or in combination.

Furthermore, although the foregoing remarks have been focused primarily on the independent claims, it will be appreciated that all of the rejections and assertions of record with respect to the independent claims, as well as the dependent claims, are now moot, and therefore need not be addressed individually. However, in this regard, it should be appreciated that Applicant does not necessarily acquiesce to any assertions in the previous Office Action that are

---

[3] Col. 8, lines 20-50. In one example, full resolver functionality is implemented in one component, where an application sends a query to a resolver, the resolver sends the query to a name server and the resolver process the response from the name server. In a second example, a stub resolver receives a request for resolution, which is looped back to a resolver incorporated into name server software, the resolver sends the request to the name server, and the resolver processes any response from the name server. In a third example, an application includes a resolver for providing resolving functionality directly to the application.

Page 13 of 14

Application No. 10/074,730
Amendment "A" dated July 26, 2005
Reply to Office Action mailed May 19, 2005

not specifically addressed above, and hereby reserves the right to challenge those assertions at any appropriate time in the future, should it arise, including any official notice

In the event that the Examiner finds any remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Dated this ___26___ day of ___July___, 2005.

Respectfully submitted,

RICK D. NYDEGGER
Registration No. 28,651
JENS C. JENKINS
Registration No. 44,803
J. LAVAR OLDHAM
Registration No. 53,409
Attorneys for Applicant
Customer No. 47973

JLO:sch
PPA0000000509V001

Page 14 of 14